

R E M A R K S

Claims 1 and 4 to 16 as set forth in Appendix IV of this paper are now pending in this case. Claim 2 has been canceled and Claims 1, 4 to 6, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 16 have been amended, as indicated in the Listing of Claims set forth in Appendix III of this paper.

Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to read on the subject matter of Claim 2 and Claim 2 has been canceled. Accordingly, the dependency of Claims 4 to 6 was amended. Additionally, applicants have revised the claims to provide proper antecedent basis.

- In Claims 1 and 10, the expression "*the hydroxylamine-containing solution*" has been replaced by --*the solution*-- which refers back to the wording "*a solution of*" occurring in the preamble of those claims.
- Correspondingly, the preamble of Claim 1 has been amended to refer to --*a solution*-- instead of "*solutions*".
- In Claims 5 and 13, the term "*again*" has been deleted, and the expression "*the vaporous fractions are*" has been replaced by --*the vaporized fraction is*-- which refers back to the wording "*a fraction of ... is vaporized*" occurring earlier in the claim.
- In Claims 6 and 14, the expression "*the liquid phase*" has been deleted.
- In Claims 9 and 16, the expression "*from the electronics industry*" has been replaced by --*a solution used for cleaning electronic components*--. Support of the revised wording is provided by applicants' disclosure on page 1, indicated lines 14 and 15, of the application.

Due to the incorporation of the features of Claim 2, the amines referenced in the preamble of Claim 1 are now being specified as part of the bottom product obtained in applicants' process.

Further, applicants have amended the paragraph on page 3, indicated lines 6 to 8, to include a reference to the rectification at from 0.8 to 1.0 atmospheres corresponding to the preferred range originally disclosed in Claim 4 and now specified in Claims 7 and 12.

No new matter has been added.

In light of applicants' revision on page 3 of the application it is respectfully requested that the objection under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(d)(1) be withdrawn. It is further respectfully requested that

the rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 4 to 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, be withdrawn in light of applicants' amendment. The changes made in the claims fully obviate the Examiner's reasons for the respective rejection. Favorable action is solicited.

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in light of the disclosure of *Watzenberger et al.* (US 5,837,107). Withdrawal of the respective rejection is respectfully solicited since Claim 1 as herewith submitted relates to the subject matter previously defined in Claim 1, albeit in independent form.

The Examiner indicated that Claims 2 and 4 to 9 would be allowable if presented in independent form, and that Claims 10 to 16 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to obviate the issues under Section 112, ¶2. In light of the foregoing and the attached, the claims herewith presented by applicants should therefore be in condition for allowance. Early action by the Examiner is appreciated.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including Extension of Time fees, to Deposit Account No. 11.0345. Please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KEIL & WEINKAUF



Herbert B. Keil
Reg. No. 18,967

1350 Connecticut Ave, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-0100

Encl.: THE SUBSTITUTE SECTION(S) OF THE SPECIFICATION (Appendix I)
THE CHANGE(S) IN THE SPECIFICATION (Appendix II)
THE LISTING OF CLAIMS (Appendix III)
THE AMENDED CLAIMS (Appendix IV)

HBK/BAS